

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 7, 2006. Claims 24-39 and 63-76 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 24-39 and 63-76.

**The Present Invention**

As claimed the present invention includes a method and system for "transparently" accessing multiple databases. A base user JAVABEAN is provided that is adapted to work through a server to an internal database. The base user JAVABEAN provides a "transparent" interface through which implicit and explicit properties can be retrieved and updated from the internal database. The user JAVABEAN is then extended such that the extended user JAVABEAN further provides a "transparent" interface through which implicit and explicit properties can be retrieved and updated from at least one external database. Transparency is defined in the specification of the patent application at page 7, paragraph 29: "As used herein, transparency generally refers to the fact that a user or application can make a call or request without care as to where the data is stored or what naming convention the data may use. If the data is in a legacy database instead of a personalization database, the UUP [unified user profile] will automatically process the request without the user or application ever needing to know about the location or name."

The invention is claimed in part via the use of the newly added phrase "further wherein the access is carried out independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of the data in the database" in all of the independent claims.

**Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 31, 33, 36, 63-69, 75-76 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.**

Claims 24, 25, 31, 33, 36, 63-69, 75-76 are objected to based on the usage of a trademark. However, it is quite clear in the MPEP that the usage of trademarks is

acceptable in this instance. Applicants have amended the specification and claims so that the trademark terms are capitalized. See MPEP Section 608.01(v) ("[E]xaminers are authorized to permit the use of the trademark if it is distinguished from common descriptive nouns by capitalization. If the trademark has a fixed and definite meaning, it constitutes sufficient identification unless some physical or chemical characteristic of the article or material is involved in the invention." . . . Trademarks should be identified by capitalizing each letter of the mark (in the case of word or letter marks).").

Rejection of Claims 24, 33, 63, 68, and 76 As Nonstatutory Subject Matter

With all due respect, the Examiner's rejection is traversed. The objected to claims are directed to software and software claims are plainly statutory subject matter under current caselaw. Also claims 33 and 68 are canceled.

Section 103 Rejection Over Singer in View of Timbol


Applicants respectfully submit that the newly added limitations in the independent claims distinguish over Singer and Timbol. In addition, applicants note that Singer only discloses the use of one database whereas all the claims require the presence of two databases.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/27/06

By:   
Sheldon R. Meyer  
Reg. No. 27,660

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800